MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION					
Type of Requestor: (x) HCP () IE () IC	Response Timely Filed? (x) Yes () No				
Requestor's Name and Address Vista Medical Center Hospital	MDR Tracking No.: M4-04-3935-01				
4301 Vista Rd.	TWCC No.:				
Pasadena, TX 77504	Injured Employee's Name:				
Respondent's Name and Address National Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pitts./Rep. Box #: 19	Date of Injury:				
C/o Flahive, Ogden & Latson 505 West 12 th Street Austin, TX 78701	Employer's Name: Browning Ferris Industries Inc				
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 9108910344				

PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due	
From	То	Ci i Code(s) of Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Duc	
12-9-02	12-28-02	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$99,802.45	\$17,872.00	

PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary of December 15, 2003 states, "... In this instance, the audited charges that remained in dispute after the last bill review by the insurance carrier were \$280,464.54. The prior amounts paid by the carrier were \$117,366.89. Therefore, the carrier is required to reimburse the remainder of the Workers' Compensation Reimbursement Amount of \$99,802.45, plus interest...".

PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary of December 15, 2003 states, "... Here, the initial \$40,000 threshold of "audited charges" may have been exceeded, but Requestor has not proven entitlement to any exception to the preferred per diem method. Such proof requires Requestor to show the services provided were unusually extensive and unusually costly for the subject admission. Requestor has failed to sustain the burden of proving that exception. In the absence of or insufficiency of such evidence, the preferred/default method of reimbursement is the per diem method...".

PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the documentation provided by both parties, it **does** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." In particular, this admission resulted in a hospital stay of 19 days. Three days of the stay were in intensive care. The operative report of 12-10-02 indicates the patient underwent a multi level fusion with instrumentation. Accordingly, the stop-loss method does apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the stop-loss methodology.

In determining the total audited charges, it must be noted that the insurance carrier has indicated some question regarding the charges for the implantables. The requestor billed \$138,152.00 for the implantables. The carrier did not allow any reimbursement the implantables. The key issue is what amount would represent the usual and customary charges for these implantables in determining the total audited charges. The requestor provided the Commission with documentation on the actual cost of implantables, \$19,003.00.

Based on a review of numerous medical disputes and our experience, the average markup for implantables in many hospitals is 200%. This amount multiplied by the average mark-up of 200% results in an audited charge for implantables equal to \$38,006.00.

The audited charges for this admission, excluding implantables, equals \$142,312.54. This amount plus the above calculated audited charges for the implantables equals \$180,318.51 the total audited charges. This amount multiplied by the stop-loss reimbursement factor (75%) results in a workers' compensation reimbursement amount equal to \$17,872.00 (\$135,238.88 - \$117,366.89 (amount paid by respondent)).

	ties' positions, and the application of the provisions rsement amount for these services equal to \$17,872			
PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION AND	OORDER			
entitled to additional reimbursement in	healthcare services, the Medical Review Divis the amount of \$17,872.00. The Division herel rest due at the time of payment to the Requesto	by ORDERS the insurance carrier to		
	Allen McDonald	6-24-05		
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date of Order		
Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative's box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744 or faxed to (512) 804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request. The party appealing the Division's Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute. Si prefiere hablar con una persona in español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.				
PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELI	IVERY CERTIFICATION			
I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision in the Austin Representative's box.				
Signature of Insurance Carrier:		Date:		